

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

**JOE RICHARD BLISSIT, and
LYNNE JOYCE BLISSIT,**

PLAINTIFF,

vs.

WESTLAKE HARDWARE, INC.,

DEFENDANT.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CASE No. 09-CV-58-TCK-FHM

OPINION AND ORDER

Defendant's Motion to Compel Supplemental Responses to First Interrogatories to Plaintiff, Joe Richard Blissit; and Motion to Compel a Privilege Log and/or Production of Documents [Dkt. 17] is before the Court for decision. Plaintiff did not file a response to Defendant's motion, but instead filed a Motion to Dismiss Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery [Dkt. 21]; that motion is also before the Court.

Defendant seeks to compel certain discovery. Plaintiff contends Defendant's motion should be "dismissed" because Defendant has not complied with the meet and confer requirements of L.Cv.R. 37.1. In reply, Defendant contends that the requirements of L.Cv.R. 37.1 have been met. [Dkt. 22] Both parties attach copies of correspondence in support of their contentions as to whether a meet and confer occurred.

The Court will not expend its resources resolving the meet and confer issue. Instead, counsel are hereby ordered to personally meet, face-to-face, and to make a good faith, sincere attempt to resolve their discovery differences. If issues remain after the personal meeting, either party may file appropriate motions.

Defendant's Motion to Compel Supplemental Responses to First Interrogatories to Plaintiff, Joe Richard Blissit; and Motion to Compel a Privilege Log and/or Production of Documents [Dkt. 17] is DENIED. Plaintiff Joe Richard Blissit's Motion to Dismiss Defendant's Motion to Compel Discovery [Dkt. 21] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this 6th day of May, 2009.


FRANK H. McCARTHY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE